

of proof on complainants, and finally on directives or administration to the States. The bill avoids Federal dictation. It won the support of the strongest conservatives in the House of Representatives and properly so. The bill has been badly misrepresented as a liberal, Federal intervention's measure. It is nothing of the sort.

I ask unanimous consent that the interesting and revealing article by Evans and Novak on the vital role of moderates and conservatives in working for enactment of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### BEHIND THE CHARADE

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Contrary to all the gloomy speculation about civil rights filibuster in the Senate, the battle is going far better for President Johnson today than seemed possible when it started.

The reason for this unusually optimistic forecast won't be found in the Senate debate. It lies in the elaborate and unprecedented system of check and cross-check between Senate and House Republicans that now control the principal actors in the congressional drama.

For example, consider the well-publicized move of Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, the Republican leader, to water down the fair employment section of the bill. Some amendment is essential to win over enough Republicans so that if cloture (the forcible ending of debate) becomes necessary, a two-thirds majority of the Senate will vote for it.

Behind the scenes, DIRKSEN shrewdly is exploiting the system of check and cross-check to hedge in those who want a very tough FEPC and those who don't want any at all. To the businessmen who have swarmed into his office the past few weeks to lobby against the FEPC section, he patiently explains that this particular provision was written not by wild-eyed Democrats in the administration but by moderate Republicans in the House, led by self-effacing Representative WILLIAM McCULLOCH, of Ohio.

Thus every change that Senator DIRKSEN would like to make, under pressure from conservative Republicans, he cross-checks with McCULLOCH, the ranking Republican of the House Judiciary Committee. McCULLOCH in turn checks with Representative CHARLES GOODELL, the New York Republican who helped draft the original language of the FEPC section in the House Labor Committee. Changes that would gut the section are rejected by McCULLOCH and company, and their veto gives DIRKSEN just the leverage he needs to withstand the conservatives.

The important restraints on DIRKSEN, in other words, do not come only from the White House or the liberal Democrats and Republicans in the Senate, but from a handful of moderate Republicans in the House.

None of these vital restraints would be operating today if the bill as it passed the House had not been truly bipartisan. The origin of this bipartisanship goes back to last fall when President Kennedy, confronted with a runaway liberal coalition in the House Judiciary Committee, appealed to McCULLOCH and Representative CHARLES HALLECK, the Republican leader, for help. HALLECK and McCULLOCH delivered.

As a result, these middle-of-the-road Republicans, who have never been civil rights zealots, have almost as much at stake in the Senate version of the bill as the all-out civil

rights partisans. Perhaps never before in Senate history has a handful of minority party Congressmen in the House held such a whip hand over the Senate.

A year ago DIRKSEN might have been far less willing to cooperate with his House colleagues.

It was only last summer that DIRKSEN extracted the heart from a Republican statement of principles on civil rights that Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, the New York liberal, tried to push through the conference of all Republican Senators.

But today, as the Negro revolution moves on an ever-ascending scale from one crisis to another, DIRKSEN knows that a strong bill is essential. And there is only a handful of Senators in either party, north of the Mason-Dixon line, who haven't been driven by the force of events to the same conclusion. As a result, practically every objective in JAVITS' statement of principles last summer is found in the House-passed civil rights bill.

Accordingly, the long and windy talk in the Senate is a charade that should not be confused with reality. The first major break may come late this week when DIRKSEN, McCULLOCH, HALLECK, GOODELL, JAVITS, and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, the Democratic master strategist in the Senate, agree on the FEPC provision.

#### TRIBUTE TO DAVID FELLMAN, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN POLITICAL SCIENCE PROFESSOR

MR. PROXIMIRE. Mr. President, a distinguished professor at the University of Wisconsin, David Fellman, who has been in the front rank of scholars in this country in delineating civil liberties, has been selected as president of the American Association of University Professors. This is a great honor for Wisconsin, for the University of Wisconsin, and for this outstanding man, who not only is a great professor, but also is a remarkably warmhearted human being.

I ask unanimous consent that an article reporting Fellman's election from the Milwaukee Journal be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AAUP PICKS UW TEACHER—UNIVERSITY ASSOCIATION NAMES FELLMAN AS ITS PRESIDENT

ST. LOUIS, Mo.—David Fellman, University of Wisconsin political science professor, has been elected president of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), at the association's convention here. Fellman, 57, was elected without opposition on a ballot mailed to association members. He has been at UW since 1947, and now is a Vilas research professor.

He served on the national council of the AAUP from 1958 to 1961, and is chairman of its committee on academic freedom and tenure. He is past president of the Wisconsin chapter.

He was appointed to the executive committee on the Wisconsin Governor's commission on human rights in 1959, and was a member of the Governor's commission on constitutional revision in 1963.

Other positions held included vice president of the American Political Science Association in 1959-60 and president of the Midwest Conference of Political Scientists in 1955.

The AAUP frequently gets into the news in disputes with universities over academic freedom.

#### THE AMERICAN PEOPLE OPPOSE THE U.S. UNILATERAL PARTICIPATION IN SOUTH VIETNAM'S CIVIL WAR

MR. GRUENING. Mr. President, while I find myself in total disagreement with the past and inherited policy of the U.S. involvement in the civil war in South Vietnam, which President Johnson now feels must for a time be continued, I find one element of hopefulness in his first public declaration of policy thereon. In his speech to the Associated Press yesterday, after stating that he had "ordered measures to step up the fighting capacity of the South Vietnamese forces," he added that "no negotiated settlement is possible as long as the Communists hope to achieve victory by force," but that—and this is the significant and hopeful statement—"once war seems hopeless, then peace may be possible."

The fact is that the United States is seeking "to achieve victory by force." Doubtless this is true of both sides. The hopeful and significant aspect of President Johnson's remark is that "once war seems hopeless, then peace may be possible."

It is my conviction that this particular war is hopeless, and has always been hopeless, and that therefore peace not only may be possible, but will be possible. It is clear to me that the President is allowing for a negotiated settlement as soon as the reality of which he speaks—namely, that once the "war seems hopeless" which means a realization that the war in South Vietnam cannot be won by the United States—becomes apparent. It is apparent to me now, and history—the history of the past decades—demonstrates it incontrovertibly.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the paragraphs from President Johnson's speech to the Associated Press dealing with South Vietnam.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (MR. MORTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

MR. GRUENING. Mr. President, President Johnson speaks of reality. Let us contrast the optimistic forecast which Secretary Rusk made after his brief visit to South Vietnam, and Ike repeated similarly optimistic forecasts of Secretary McNamara, with the realistic statements by our American "advisers" who have been on the scene for months. Secretary Rusk, in praising Nguyen Khanh, South Vietnam's self-imposed—with our help—ruler, said, "He is making progress." But a special dispatch to the New York Times, published in it on Monday, April 20, is headed "U.S. Advisers Say Inertia Besets Vietnamese Army." The opening paragraph of the article refers to the "inertia and low motivation of the South Vietnamese Army." This is the opinion of our American military "advisers"; and they have been there much longer than Secretary Rusk and Secretary McNamara.

Our military "advisers" there further express the belief that no amount of social and economic planning can inspire an army to do its job against highly purposeful insurgents, unless there is a will to win, or at least a will to fight. It has long been clear that there has not been, and is not now, a will to win or a will to fight in the South Vietnamese forces.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks the article entitled "Rusk Lauds Progress of Khanh in Reporting on Trip to Vietnam." The article was published in the Washington Post of April 21—as well as an article entitled "U.S. Advisers Say Inertia Bets Vietnamese Army," which was published on April 20 in the New York Times.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.  
(See exhibit 2.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the 3-minute limitation, the time of the Senator from Alaska has expired.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, support of the view of these "advisers" and of the position which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] and I have taken in regard to U.S. military engagement in South Vietnam, is found in an article written by Walter Lippmann, and published on April 21 in the Washington Post.

After properly taking Richard Nixon to task for his proposal to carry the war into North Vietnam, Mr. Lippmann points out that "the South Vietnamese have very little fighting morale." Mr. Lippmann also gives us a reality when he says the problem in South Vietnam is to prevent the collapse of a weak government which is losing the civil war.

That is precisely correct, Mr. President; it is a civil war, it is a losing civil war. The sooner the United States faces those two realities, the better.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks the article by Walter Lippmann, which is entitled "Foreign Policy Debate."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.  
(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in a dispatch from Washington, published today in the New York Times, Secretary Rusk is reported as having encouraged the new government of Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh to improve its "international image." Just what is meant by that, I do not know. But, more important, I believe he should improve his image among the South Vietnamese people, who have had such lack of enthusiasm in their support of the two preceding regimes, as well as his, because of the repressive actions of their own governments.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record at the conclu-

sion of my remarks the New York Times article entitled "Rusk Says Saigon May Ask for Non-U.S. Military Advisers."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.  
(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the American people want no part in the unilateral war in which our American boys are being sacrificed. They cannot but wonder why our SEATO allies, while urging us to keep on, are not sending their boys into the firing line there. Only American boys, in addition to the Vietnamese, are being sacrificed. I consider this a needless tragedy which should be stopped. I have asked before, and I ask again, where are the boys of our British, French, Australian, New Zealand, Philippine, Pakistan, and Thai allies in SEATO? Why are there no British boys, French boys, Australian boys, New Zealand boys, Philippine boys, Pakistan boys, and Thai boys on the firing line?

Mr. President, I have received some 400 letters since my speech on March 10, urging that the United States get out of Vietnam. They run in a ratio of 100 to 1 in favor of my position. They reveal unmisgivingly that the American people oppose our unilateral military participation in South Vietnam's civil war.

I ask unanimous consent that portions of some of these letters be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.  
(See exhibit 5.)

#### EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Apr. 21, 1964]  
EXCERPT FROM PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S SPEECH BEFORE THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

In Korea we proved the futility of direct aggression. In Vietnam the Communists today try the more insidious, but the equally dangerous, methods of subversion and terror and guerrilla warfare.

They conduct a campaign organized, directed, supplied, and supported from Hanoi. This, too, we will prove futile.

Armed Communist attack on Vietnam is today a reality. The fighting spirit of South Vietnam, as Secretary Rusk told us from there yesterday, is a reality. The request of a friend and an ally for our help in this terrible moment is a reality.

The statement of the SEATO allies that Communist defeat is essential is a reality. To fail to respond to these realities would reflect on our honor as a Nation, would undermine worldwide confidence in our courage, would convince every nation in south Asia that it must now bow to Communist terms to survive.

The situation in Vietnam is difficult, but there is an old American saying that "when the going gets tough, the tough gets going."

So let no one doubt that we are in this battle as long as South Vietnam wants our support and needs our assistance to protect its freedom.

#### MORE AID FOR VIETNAMESE

I have already ordered measures to step up the fighting capacity of the South Vietnamese forces, to help improve the welfare and the moral of their civilian population, to keep our forces at whatever level continued independence and freedom require.

No negotiated settlement in Vietnam is possible as long as the Communists hope to achieve victory by force. Once war seems hopeless, then peace may be possible. The door is always open to any settlement which

assures the independence of South Vietnam and its freedom to seek help for its protection.

#### EXHIBIT 2

RUSK LAUDS PROGRESS OF KHANH IN REPORTING ON TRIP TO VIETNAM

(By Warren Unna)

Secretary of State Dean Rusk returned late yesterday from an on-the-spot inspection trip to South Vietnam and immediately reported to President Johnson how struck he was with the new Vietnamese ruler, Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh.

Khanh is an impressive man . . . great vigor and understanding. He's on the right track and he's making progress," Rusk told reporters after emerging from his White House conference with the President.

He indicated that he found "a number of provinces" where pacification measures against the Vietcong Communist infiltration movement are "going ahead."

In a statement at Saigon just before boarding his plane for Washington, Rusk had given Khanh all-out U.S. support: "We shall remain at your side until the aggression from the North has been defeated—until it has been completely rooted out and this land enjoys the peace which it deserves," Rusk declared.

In talking with reporters at the White House, Rusk noticeably abstained from all remarks about Laos where a military coup had made that country the subject of the moment.

But earlier in the day, President Johnson told an Associated Press luncheon in New York that he had dispatched William P. Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, to Laos "for a firsthand examination of the developments."

The President reaffirmed American support for the 1962 Geneva agreement for a neutral Laos under neutralist Premier Prince Souvanna Phouma, explaining such an arrangement offers "the best hope of peace and independence for that strife-torn land."

The State Department, meanwhile, indicated that the outcome of Sunday's military coup was far from clear.

U.S. officials were heartened by the fact that the coup leaders had released Prince Souvanna from his house arrest and accompanied him on a trip to the royal capital of Luang Prabang for a conference with Laos King.

But State Department officials were still not sure how far the military leaders had backed away from their abrupt takeover. Nor were they sure what demands Laos Communist-oriented Pathet-Lao might now make because of the military's breach of faith in trying to scrap the coalition government.

It was also not clear whether the military coup leaders now would be disciplined for their action, or allowed to remain at their posts in a new government.

On Capitol Hill, Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, said the original report of the coup and the arrest of Souvanna "was mad news for Laos, for the United States, and for all of southeast Asia."

"He [Souvanna] was, and is, the only man who could have been successful in keeping his country from being fragmented," MANSFIELD added.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 20, 1964]  
U.S. ADVISERS SAY INERTIA BESETS VIETNAMESE ARMY

(By Peter Grose)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, April 19.—Pursuit of the war against the Communist Vietcong appears to face the basic obstruction of inertia and low motivation of the South Vietnamese Army, in the judgment of American military advisers.



1964

These advisers believe that no amount of aid or social and economic planning can inspire an army to do its job against highly purposeful insurgents unless there is a will to win, or at least a will to fight.

(Vietcong guerrillas launched a bold series of attacks Sunday, one within 14 miles of Saigon, the Associated Press reported. It said American advisers there were pleased with the way the South Vietnamese had met them.)

#### FIELD ADVISERS INTERVIEWED

Dozens of American advisers to Vietnamese field units were interviewed in recent weeks in different parts of South Vietnam. Theirs is the view of the war as it is actually being fought.

They report isolated improvements of morale where the Government has implemented reforms, such as pay raises for certain units, new uniforms for paramilitary forces.

But old abuses—promotions too often granted for political reasons, discipline and punishment applied erratically—remain to sap the army's spirit.

These criticisms find echoes in high official quarters, both American and Vietnamese. In his 2½ months in power the Premier Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, has shown that he is fully aware of the problem.

Remedies, however, are found to be not only elusive but dangerous when army elements, if pressed too hard, are fully capable of turning against their own government by plotting coups d'état or defecting to the Communist Vietcong.

"All the talk in Saigon about gaining the support of the population to win this war is fine," said one American in the field. "But it would also be a good idea to try to gain the support of the army. This may be a political war, but it is still a war."

To most Americans, repeated Vietcong successes derive less from insurgents than from the apathy and ineptness of the Government forces. Success feeds on success and with each Vietcong victory the Government troops morale drops further.

American policy, underlined in the visits to Vietnam of Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and Secretary of State Dean Rusk, is that active leadership from the top can still overcome the inertia of the war effort.

U.S. sources said Mr. Rusk, in his meeting yesterday with General Khanh, had reviewed means of improving U.S. military, economic and diplomatic assistance to Saigon.

Mr. Rusk was said to be satisfied that General Khanh would not be victim of a coup, as has been rumored recently. The general himself came to power through a coup on January 30.

#### RUSK REPORTED ENCOURAGED

The Secretary was said to be encouraged by the Khanh government's recent steps in both the military and civilian fields. While difficulties remain, Mr. Rusk was said to feel that for the first time since when the President Ngo Dinh Diem was ousted, "things are beginning to move."

This was Mr. Rusk's first visit to Saigon since he became Secretary of State. The Rusk party came here from Manila, where the Secretary attended a meeting of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization's Council of Ministers. En route to Saigon Mr. Rusk stopped for a day in Taipei, Taiwan, and his plane is scheduled to stop there again for refueling tomorrow on his return to Washington.

Official American optimism notwithstanding, the view from the field headquarters in South Vietnam is that it is taking all too long for the new energy in Saigon to filter down.

Many U.S. advisers feel that increased military aid is not the answer and may only compound the army's sluggishness.

"This is supposed to be a counterinsurgency effort fought with guerrilla tactics,"

said one high adviser in the central lowlands. "When we urge the Vietnamese to fight like guerrillas, they just call for air strikes and heavy artillery."

Some Americans also speak of the ambiguity of their advisory position. They cannot command troops. Their advice, if given on the spot, may cause a Vietnamese commander to lose face with his men. Advice given later in private may come too late.

Anything money can buy Premier Khanh is in the process of providing. He has announced, for instance, pay increases for both the regular army and the paramilitary forces, the civil guard and the self-defense corps, which bear the brunt of Vietcong attacks. Discrepancies between the pay and privileges of the army and those of the paramilitary forces have been a major subject of complaints.

#### EXHIBIT 3

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 21, 1964]

#### FOREIGN POLICY DEBATE

(By Walter Lippmann)

After spending a few days in Saigon, Mr. Nixon has come home with a formula for winning the war in southeast Asia. The reason we are not winning it now is, he says, that we believe in "Yalu River concepts of private sanctuaries," and for that reason we are preventing the South Vietnamese, who presumably are raring to go, from taking the offensive, from carrying the war into Laos and to the North, and of winning the war there.

Mr. Nixon ought to know better, and perhaps he does know better, than to say that the reason why South Vietnam does not win the war in North Vietnam is that the United States won't let it. The undubitable fact is that South Vietnam is quite incapable of carrying the war successfully into North Vietnam. That is not because we will not give it arms. We do give it arms. It is because the South Vietnamese have very little fighting morale and are well aware from experiments that have already been made that raiding in North Vietnam means almost certain death. Let us hope that Mr. Nixon is not going to revive at this late date the old chestnut which we used to hear about "unleashing Chiang Kai-shek," and ask us to believe that victory can be had by unleashing General Khanh.

General Khanh is leashed by the unwillingness of the large majority of the South Vietnamese to fight on in the civil war. "Hot pursuit" indeed: where are the South Vietnamese soldiers who are hot about pursuing the Vietcong into the clutches of General Giap? The truth, which is being obscured for the American people, is that the Saigon government has the allegiance of probably no more than 30 percent of the people and controls (even in daylight) not much more than a quarter of the territory.

The real and immediate problem in South Vietnam is to prevent a collapse of a weak government which is losing the civil war. That is the paramount objective of the Johnson-McNamara policy—to prevent a bad situation from becoming impossible. It is certainly not a glorious policy, or even a promising one, and it has led high officials of the administration into making commitments that had better been left unmade. But the policy is at least concerned with the reality of the situation, which is the need to prevent a collapse and surrender before there is an opportunity to work out a political solution in the area.

Any other plan for winning the war in southeast Asia must be, if the speaker is being candid and not tricky, a plan for the intervention of the United States with large forces prepared to overwhelm the whole of Indochina and to confront mainland China itself. All schemes for "interdicting" out-

side help to the Viet Cong can be carried out only by the U.S. Air Force. The South Vietnamese Government does not have the bombers and could not fly them if they had them in any such enterprise. The enterprise should never be undertaken unless we are prepared to have a large war with China.

In his review of foreign policy on Monday, the President was, in effect, saying that there has been no material change since the death of President Kennedy. Our relations with Russia, which took a decided turn for the better between the Cuban crisis and the test ban treaty, have continued to improve, slowly, to be sure, but to improve.

On the other hand, in the areas where President Kennedy had not been succeeding, things are about as they were. This is true of Europe, of Asia, and of South America. There is a pause in Europe and perhaps also in Latin America. This may be in part because new developments have not gone far enough to show what is going to happen, in part because of the coming elections—here and in Britain and in Chile this year, in Germany and France and Brazil next year. There is a pause in the Far East because the war plans of Messrs. Nixon and Goldwater are unworkable and undesirable, and any other kind of plan is, as Senator Fulbright would say, still unthinkable.

This pause permits President Johnson to devote himself primarily to our too long postponed and too much neglected internal problems.

#### EXHIBIT 4

[From the New York Times, Apr. 21, 1964]

#### RUSK SAYS SAIGON MAY ASK FOR NON-U.S. MILITARY ADVISERS

WASHINGTON, April 20.—Secretary of State Dean Rusk said today that South Vietnam could use the help of more military advisers from other countries than the United States in its war against Communist guerrillas.

Mr. Rusk, who just returned from an 11-day trip to Asia, including his first visit to South Vietnam, reported on his findings to President Johnson at the White House this evening.

Afterward, Mr. Rusk said that several of this country's allies had expressed their willingness to help South Vietnam combat the guerrillas of the Vietnamese Communists, or Vietcong.

Mr. Rusk said he did not expect that any organized military units would be sent to Vietnam "at this time" to bolster the efforts of 15,500 U.S. servicemen there.

But he said that Saigon might be asking for some military advisers from other countries and could make good use of them. At present, Australia has a 30-man military advisory mission in Vietnam and Britain has about 10 officers.

#### AID OFFERS REPORTED

In the field of economic and technical assistance, the Secretary reported that the Philippines and Nationalist China had offered to help South Vietnam meet its current shortage of fertilizer. South Vietnam is about to enter its spring planting season.

Mr. Rusk said he had made several recommendations in the political field in his report to the President, but he declined to discuss them in detail.

He indicated that he had encouraged the new Government of Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh to improve its international image and "in explaining its situation to the rest of the world." During the political upheavals of the last 6 months in South Vietnam, he said, the Government had allowed its diplomacy to slip.

Although he acknowledged on his arrival that the situation in South Vietnam was critical, Mr. Rusk said he thought that General Khanh was "on the right track" and

that the situation had shown "steady improvement."

Present to hear his report at the White House were Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, Under Secretary of State George W. Ball and McGeorge Bundy, the President's Special Assistant for National Security Affairs.

#### PEIPING INTERVENTION DOUBTED

In a separate development, another Government official said he doubted that Communist China would intervene militarily if South Vietnam, with American support, undertook military strikes against North Vietnam provided the strikes were limited.

"Red China's attitude would be of some reluctance to getting themselves too much involved," this official said. "At the same time, they would scream and yell to try to intimidate us and South Vietnam."

Although some officials have declared that no such offensive action against North Vietnam is being contemplated, qualified sources said these moves are under study by the administration.

In his comments today, one Government official close to the situation said the Communist Chinese response would depend on Peiping's estimate of which South Vietnam and the United States were up to.

If China thought the aim was limited and directed merely at ending the war in South Vietnam, rather than taking North Vietnam, he said, "the chances of their coming into the war in any major way would seem to be limited."

#### VIETNAM RAID COSTLY TO REDS

SAIGON, April 20.—Government troops, counterattacking in Kien Hoa province 50 miles south of Saigon, inflicted heavy losses on Vietcong guerrillas in one of the war's most successful operations of the kind U.S. military officials reported today.

The engagement began before dawn yesterday when two companies of Vietcong insurgents overran the Huong Hoa Ha outpost near Ba Tri. The Communists seized as hostages the wives and children of the members of the self-defense corps who manned the outpost.

The corpsmen regrouped and recaptured the post in what the Americans called an "excellent counterattack carried out quickly and efficiently." Government losses were listed as 14 killed and 26 missing. The guerrilla losses were estimate as much higher. A Defense Ministry communique estimated Vietcong losses at 100 killed and wounded. U.S. military advisers counted 15 dead on the battlefield and said aerial reconnaissance indicated that at least 67 killed or wounded were carried away by their comrades.

Americans said they were impressed with the action of the self-defense corpsmen because it reflected a determination to defend their homes in one of the most critical parts of the guerrilla-infested Mekong River delta.

In another action, the Vietcong derailed the Saigon-Hue train for the 10th time in 20 days. The train, moving on one of South Vietnam's most vital communication links, was derailed in Phuyen province 250 miles north of Saigon, midway between Hue and Saigon.

Vietnamese military authorities said only two cars were damaged, but traffic was delayed for 12 hours.

The U.S. Army announced the death of WO David E. Muller of Olney, Ill., who suffered burns 10 days ago in the crash of an unarmed helicopter 125 miles south of Saigon. Three other Americans and seven Vietnamese soldiers were killed in the crash.

The South Vietnamese, meanwhile, were reported heartened by Secretary of State Dean Rusk's pledge that American forces would remain until the Vietcong forces are defeated.

Mr. Rusk, who left early today, had warm

praise for the Premier, Maj. Gen. Nguyen Khanh, who seized power in January. Mr. Rusk expressed confidence in General Khanh's ability to lead the country to victory over the Communists.

KETCHIKAN, ALASKA,  
March 23, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: You are to be congratulated for your courageous stand on the South Vietnam mess. We can only hope that more and more of our legislators will eventually see the light. Maybe then we can finally let those people in Asia determine their own destiny without sacrificing any more of our GI's.

Hats off to you, Senator.

Sincerely,

PHILIP C. HOFFMANN.

MOUNT VERNON, MO.,  
March 30, 1964.

Senator GRUENING,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Thank you for having enough courage to speak out against this shameful and unnecessary intervention in the war in South Vietnam. . . . It is quite clear that our support is on the side of the people's oppressors. No wonder the national army of South Vietnam is not in touch with the people. And no wonder there is such low morale among its soldiers and no wonder so many defect to the other side. They have little desire for killing their own people to keep cruel and vicious dictators in power. There is no national interest there for which our boys should die, and the longer we stay in this struggle, the closer we come to the brink of nuclear war and world holocaust. Our boys are fighting, not just teaching the South Vietnamese how to fight. That is why so many are being killed. . . . If the South Vietnamese must win their war and must be closer in touch with the people to do it, why don't we let them do this? It is pretty certain that we are hastening the day for communism to take over, as long as we continue to support the wrong side. Keep up the good work. You are speaking for millions of Americans.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. STEPHEN B. CRUMPLEY.

BROOKLINE, MASS.,  
March 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: My husband and I are delighted to read, in the New York Times of March 21, that you are asking for the withdrawal of U.S. forces from the frightful war in South Vietnam.

We congratulate you not only for taking this intelligent position, but also for having the courage to give leadership on this issue in the Senate. We need more Senators like you.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

ETHEL and BEN ALPER.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,  
April 5, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING.

DEAR SENATOR: We wish to express our heartfelt agreement and gratitude for the expression of your views on our foreign policy vis-a-vis South Vietnam. We also have long felt the wrongness of our position in South Vietnam.

We ought indeed to withdraw our armed forces from such gross interference in the affairs of other countries; and always supporting reactionary, tyrannical regimes. In pattern, our foreign policies have not much changed from the times in the thirties when in the name of "anticommunism" we al-

ways had support to give to "anti-Communists" like Mussolini, Franco, Hitler, etc., through loans, direct aid, and appeasement generally.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

Mr. and Mrs. SAMUEL KAMEN.

NEW YORK CITY, N.Y.

Hon. Senator ERNEST GRUENING,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: You must be congratulated upon your stand on Vietnam. As a veteran of the Second World War (WAAC and WAC), as a woman, a citizen, and also a member of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, I agree with you.

Please keep up the good fight.

Cordially,

VERNA ALTMAN.

LONG ISLAND, N.Y.,  
March 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I was gratified to read of your outspoken remarks re our policy on Vietnam. Certainly, the public must come to realize that we do not belong there, and that we will no more succeed there than did the French before us.

We should get out of Vietnam.

Sincerely,

CHARLES ECKSTAT.

BEEKLEY, MICH.,  
April 8, 1964.

Senator GRUENING,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We were happy to hear your comments on South Vietnam. The involvement of our country in this war is a disgrace and cannot be rationally justified in view of events there. We hope the United States can successfully withdraw before it becomes another Korean war.

Yours truly,

LAWRENCE D. FAYRO,  
RUTH G. FAYRO.

CHICAGO, ILL.,  
March 21, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,  
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I read your statement recently regarding South Vietnam. I am in full accord with you.

There must be a stop at once of all this unnecessary bloodshed.

For God's sake let us pull out our troops and let South Vietnam settle their own differences.

Wishing you good health and happiness, I remain,

Faithfully yours,

Mrs. MILDRED FALK.

P.S. I admire your courage and fortitude on this issue. Thank you.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,  
March 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Congratulations on your brave stand on South Vietnam. Reading the Times on your encounter is most heartening and makes me feel we at last have men in the Senate. Can you send me your speech on the issue?

We must stop this cruel and senseless war. We must stop all war.

Thank you.

RUBIN FALK.

PORTLAND, OREG.,  
March 30, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,  
U.S. Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I have read with great interest your recent remarks in Congress with respect to withdrawing military



1964

8341

aid to the Vietnam Government. It is shocking to me that the United States should be in the position of supplying the means for the people in Vietnam to kill one another. I hope your statements will give courage to others in Congress to reexamine our position there for I firmly believe the sooner we withdraw all military aid to Vietnam the sooner a peaceful settlement to affairs there will be achieved.

Sincerely yours,

HELEN F. GROSSMAN,

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY,

New York, N.Y., March 21, 1964.

Hon. SENATOR GRUENING,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I wish to commend you upon your forthright declaration urging the end of the Vietnam war, as reported in the New York Times of Saturday, March 21. It is imperative that individuals in positions of authority act, as you have. That is the only way to prevail over the counsels of those who would not only continue a full-scale war, but escalate it, with risk of a nuclear conflict.

I would appreciate receiving a copy of your statement.

Respectfully yours,

EDWIN S. CAMPELL,

Associate Professor of Chemistry,

WALLINGFORD, PA.

April 4, 1964.

SENATOR GRUENING: I am grateful for your earnest and arduous effort to convince the Senate that the only right course for the United States to take in Vietnam is to withdraw our military forces. I should be glad if our legislators based their decision of every social question primarily on the moral law.

MARGARET E. DUNGAN,

ALCONAC, MICH.

March 30, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: How right you are that our "adventure" in Vietnam is doomed to failure and disgrace for us as a nation.

We are supporting a brutal Fascist dictatorship there. General Khanh is little better than his predecessor, despite our attempt to whitewash him.

To the Vietnamese people we are the hated foreigners who have come from across the seas to kill them and destroy their homes and crops and animals.

This is really something to be proud of, isn't it, and there is not one valid excuse for our being there.

We shall live to rue the day of this vicious policy.

Please continue your opposition to this madness. You will find plenty of support, I assure you.

More power to you, Senator. You are a sane and courageous voice in a conglomeration of mediocrity and cowardice.

I surely sympathize with your people in Alaska—now let us demand that foreign aid millions be diverted to Alaska.

Sincerely,

D. FLORENCE FAGE,

CONCORD, CALIF.

March 22, 1964.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,  
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I recently heard a brief news report which indicated that you favored a greater exploration of the possibility of withdrawing U.S. forces from Vietnam. News reports of this type are often scanty of detail, and of doubtful authenticity. However, if this one is correctly reflect-

ing your feelings please permit me, as a former Alaskan, to commend you for your position.

For too long a time, U.S. foreign policy decisions have been in the hands of a small group of people too well insulated from the scrutiny of the Congress. Much greater questioning of critical decisions is long overdue. Our policy in Vietnam is not only irrational, but from the long range viewpoint, of doubtful value to the United States, the Vietnamese, or the world. Such ill-conceived policies, I believe, result largely from too great a removal of the decision making process from public participation. If I am correctly interpreting your position in this matter, let me urge you to join with Senator MANSFIELD and others to explore more fully the possibilities of a neutralist solution to the southeast Asia question.

From a nostalgic ex-Alaskan, my congratulations for a commendable record in the Senate. Best wishes for continued success.

Very truly yours,

ROLAND F. GRAY.

PORTLAND, OREG.,

March 13, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Permit a resident of the "lower 48" to congratulate you on your calling for the withdrawal of our troops from South Vietnam, as reported by the Associated Press today.

My husband, child, and I visited your State this past summer, and fell in love with it. We look forward to returning for further travel in its vast reaches as soon as possible. Because of this I felt a kind of special pride in reading of your statements in the Senate, and felt that I must let you know of my support, along with my support of your colleague, our own good Senator MORSE.

We—my husband and I—have a great respect for the strong feelings of freedom and true democracy which we sensed in Alaska, and we are happy to note that in your assessment of the situation in South Vietnam you are further expressing these basic democratic beliefs.

Sincerely yours,

PHOEBE L. FRIEDMAN

Mrs. Phoebe L. Friedman.

RALPH FRIEDMAN.

LA JOLLA, CALIF., March 21, 1964.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,  
Senate of the United States,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: As an old sourdough from Cordova now living in La Jolla I wish to commend you on your stand re Vietnam as quoted in the enclosed clipping. I am sending this clipping along to see if you are honestly quoted, and asking that it be returned for my file.

Thanking you for doing a statesmanlike job for Alaska and the United States.

Very sincerely yours,

HOWARD Z. DUDLEY.

SPARTA, N.J.

March 30, 1964.

Senator GRUENING,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: \*\*\* I wish, also, to take this opportunity to applaud most heartily your recent stand, together with Senator MORSE, regarding our stupid involvement in South Vietnam, than which I cannot imagine any asininity more calculated to guarantee frustration and disillusionment.

Sincerely,

P. D. BOOTHROYD.

METHODIST FEDERATION

FOR SOCIAL ACTION,

Ardsley, N.Y., April 9, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We praise your calling for an end to our hideous, futile, and meaningless war in South Vietnam.

We hope other Senators will support you.

Sincerely,

LEE H. BALL.

NEWARK, N.J.,

March 21, 1964.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I stayed out of the controversy over Vietnam until I read the New York Times this morning. Now I take pen in hand.

I want you to know that I am writing President Johnson and my own Senators (CASE and WILLIAMS) urging the modification of our policy to the point of seeking a multinational agreement on a settlement, and that there be no expansion of the sanguine conflict.

The governing regime in Saigon, like its predecessors, lacks majority popular support; and no essential American interests are at stake there. The frightful logic of our remaining there leads either to defeat or willful expansion of the war—which means ultimate final defeat for mankind.

For the true notes you sound, my heartfelt thanks.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT LOWENSTEIN.

ST. LOUIS, Mo.,

March 18, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am writing to voice my wholehearted support of your call for the United States to get out of South Vietnam. Our involvement is utterly irrational and is causing unnecessary bloodshed on both sides. More power to you.

Sincerely yours,

SOL LONDE.

SANTA MONICA, CALIF.

March 26, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I learned that you recently joined the small handful of Senators who have begun to question the war and our involvement in South Vietnam and that you called outright for our withdrawal from this unhappy country. I want you to know how much I appreciate hearing of one more courageous and sane voice. It is a relief to know that at least some of those who represent us in Washington begin to advocate a more rational and sensible course before disaster in South Vietnam takes on ever more alarming forms (it is alarming enough as of now). I have also repeatedly written President Johnson (and before him President Kennedy) pleading that no such insane course as extending the war into North Vietnam be followed and that neutralization be negotiated, and I have also written to my own Senators and to Senator FULBRIGHT. I have been very much disturbed over this entire war for many years, over the inexcusable way we have treated the Vietnamese people (or contributed to) in herding them into strategic hamlets (so-called), forcing them to leave behind their possessions, destroying their country with napalm bombing and destroying or poisoning their soil and plants, and forcing them to fight a war they don't want to fight—and I have been disturbed also over the fact that our involvement in South Vietnam is

April 21

in clear violation of the provisions with which the Indo-Chinese war was ended. The only way out, I feel, is to negotiate together with the other nations which worked out the original Geneva agreements neutralization of both parts of Vietnam (and among the negotiating nations obviously must be included mainland China). I feel with Senator MANSFIELD and others that for us there is no national interest involved in Vietnam and therefore the sooner we abandon this futile, costly, dangerous, and unwarranted and unjustified enterprise, the better it will be.

Thank you again for associating yourself with the few voices of sanity.

Sincerely,

IRMGARD LENKE.

STATE COLLEGE, PA.,  
March 12, 1964.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I think I am not alone in the growing feeling that we need to reexamine what we have been doing in Vietnam. For this reason, I am sending you the enclosed editorial page from our local newspaper.

For over 10 years, we have been supporting a war in Vietnam. And there is no evidence that the people of Vietnam want us there, that our enormous aid is effective, that this does anything but damage our reputation in Asia and the rest of the world.

It is my hope that you will support Senator MANSFIELD and press for an honorable and peaceful solution.

Sincerely,

DOROTHY LEEPER,  
Mrs. Robert Leeper.

WINNETKA, ILL.,  
April 2, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to commend you on your remarks on Vietnam. The people of that war-torn country are the last ones to be considered in official discussions of political and military solutions to the problem. Recent pictures in newspapers have for the first time shown the burned bodies of small children which result from the untenable position in which our country finds itself. Those are our weapons which burn children.

If the Government cannot realize that here again we are on the wrong side of a struggle—let them at least not threaten to involve us in a world holocaust by extending their illegal interference into another country: North Vietnam.

I am enclosing a brochure sponsored by several groups which tries to clarify some of the issues.

Again, the thanks of interested citizens are due you for your courageous stand.

Respectfully yours,

LELA LEDERMAN.

#### Vietnam: War or Peace?

##### THIS IS THE ROAD TO WAR

Expansion of the war, and its extension into North Vietnam could mean:

1. More American soldiers and money in Vietnam. The 15,000 men we now have there will not be enough. The \$1,500,000 we now spend there each day will be greatly increased.

Senator MANSFIELD has said that the intensification of the war "could involve an expenditure of American lives and resources on a scale that would bear little relationship to the interests of the United States or, indeed to the interests of the people of Vietnam."

2. Retaliation by the North Vietnam Army. Their modern fully equipped army

could drive below the 17th parallel into South Vietnam.

3. Intervention by China and Russia and peril of escalation into nuclear war.

John S. Knight of the Chicago Daily News said (March 7) that to carry the war into North Vietnam and risk another Korea "would surely lead to Chinese intervention and could precipitate a nuclear war between the United States and the Soviet Union."

4. Isolation of the United States from her allies. Most of our allies do not want an extension of the Vietnam war. In fact, most agree with De Gaulle that North and South Vietnam should be neutralized and protected from interference from East and West.

Write or wire President Johnson now.

##### THIS IS THE ROAD TO PEACE

An immediate conference should be called of all nations involved in the dispute for the purpose of achieving a settlement.

The United States must work for a peaceful solution in South Vietnam, as opposed to a military solution.

This will eliminate the danger of a nuclear war and, at the same time, assist an underdeveloped country to achieve a decent life for its people.

It would end the continuing loss of American and Vietnamese lives.

The people of South Vietnam have the right to choose the kind of government they want.

Chinese domination can be resisted by a strong, independent Vietnam. Up to the present time, North Vietnam has retained its independence.

Therefore, we urge you to write or wire President Johnson now. Ask for peaceful solution to Vietnam crisis.

##### HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE VIETNAM CRISIS

Vietnam, populated centuries ago by migrants from southern China, won independence from China in the 10th century, fought Chinese domination for 1,000 years.

In 1885 France colonized the territory now known as North and South Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, called Indochina. After 85 years of exploitation, France gave Indochina to Japan without a shot being fired.

During World War II Vietnamese formed National Liberation Movement called Vietminh, now called Vietcong. Vietnamese freed themselves from foreign domination briefly in 1945. France attempted to regain their colony—bloody war ensued until 1954—France defeated—Geneva Conference convened.

Geneva Conference decisions:

1. Recognized independence of all Vietnam. Signatory powers were France, Britain, Canada, India, Russia, et al.

2. Vietnam divided at 17th parallel with free elections to be held by 1956 to reunify country. France was to turn over power to Vietminh in north and to Emperor Bao Dai in south.

3. All foreign troops to be withdrawn by 1956.

United States verbally agreed to Geneva agreement but intervened in South Vietnam to help Ngo Dinh Diem form a pro-Western dictatorship—overthrown in November 1963.

Terror and suffering still stalk this war-ravaged land. We are now faced with expanding war in Vietnam, or finding peaceful solutions.

These organizations cooperated in issuing this leaflet:

Chicago Council Emma Lazarus Clubs.  
Chicago Women for Peace.  
Niles Township Women for Peace.  
North Shore Women for Peace.  
Rogers Park Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.  
Skokie Liberal Democratic Club.  
Skokie Valley Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

BROOKLINE, MASS.,

March 23, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: My husband and I are delighted to read (in the New York Times of March 21) that you are asking for the withdrawal of U.S. forces from the frightful war in South Vietnam.

We congratulate you not only for taking this intelligent position, but also for having the courage to give leadership on this issue in the Senate. We need more Senators like you.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

ETHEL and BEN ALPER.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY,

Middletown, Conn., March 21, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: May I express my agreement with your words on Vietnam as reported in the New York Times of today. I not only regret the loss of the lives of Americans killed, but also of Vietnamese peasant families burned by napalm bombs, etc. The French feared that Algeria would become Communist if the French ceased to fight. Algeria is not Communist and French prestige has grown after their "abandonment" of Algeria.

Sincerely yours,

HANS KOHN.

DEAR SENATOR: Please accept my sincere thanks for your very fine speech criticising our interference in the internal affairs of South Vietnam.

It seems obvious to me that the puppet governments of South Vietnam have no support from the people in that country, in their fight against the Vietcong.

The French have tried it for 8 years and were finally defeated with the debacle at Dienbienphu.

It is time we reappraised our foreign policy vis-a-vis southeast Asia, where the people are on the move to remove their discredited and bankrupt puppets and set up a democratic form of government.

Thanking you again for your very fine effort in bringing our boys home 7,000 miles from our shores in a futile futile frustrating war.

I remain,

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN KATZEN.

RESEDA, CALIF.,

March 24, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING.

DEAR SIR: Please add my name to the list of those who urge that America withdraw her troops from Vietnam now.

Most sincerely,

PHYLLIS F. HERNBERGER.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,

March 29, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR: I am heartily in accord with your view that we should get out of South Vietnam. It is indeed their war and not ours. We have no business fighting the cold war on their territory and it is quite obvious that there is no will or incentive to fight.

Thank you and keep up your courageous stand.

Sincerely,

PAULA KLINGHOFFER.

FOREST HILLS, N.Y.,

March 25, 1964.

Senator GRUENING,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am writing to let you know that you have our support on your stand on Vietnam. We have no right to send our boys to be killed. Let the people there decide what kind of government they want. Let's use the billions of dollars



1964

8343

spent in Vietnam to better the conditions of our people at home.  
Very truly yours,

BELLA KAPLOW.

SHONTO BOARDING SCHOOL,  
Tonalea, Ariz., March 31, 1964.

Hon. Senator ERNEST GRUENING,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: We read with much interest your fiery and timely speech which you delivered in the U.S. Senate on March 13, 1964. We admire your courage in coming out publicly to inform the people of this country about our inevitable futile cause in South Vietnam.

We wholeheartedly support you and we know many of our fellow Americans share your convictions, that the fight in South Vietnam can be won only by Vietnamese themselves. They need to make greater sacrifices and assume broader responsibility in a struggle that is legitimately theirs. We further agree that this is a fight that is not our fight and we need to get our young men out of South Vietnam before more young American lives are lost.

We do hope that President Johnson will give the crucial situation in South Vietnam his immediate attention. Many parents are looking to him to take the necessary action that will bring our boys back to this country.

We share with other parents much anxiety and concern over the safety of their sons who are assigned to military duty in South Vietnam. Our youngest son, Archie, is serving in a helicopter unit. He was hit by shrapnel in the face last December and, thank God, it was not too serious. He did not want to us to know that he came close to getting killed; we learned about it from a letter he wrote recently to his brother. We worry about him constantly.

It is most gratifying to know that a fellow Alaskan and a great Congressman has the courage and who feels it his duty to expound on the southeast Asia issue, urging our Congressmen to take a hard look at our position in South Vietnam. We agree, let us supply them with arms but not our men. Our troops should be withdrawn immediately.

We wish you much success in your great fight to save our young men from risking their lives in a country so reluctant to fight its own fight.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH M. KAHLEN,  
VIVIAN M. KAHLEN,

BALTIMORE, Md.,  
March 21, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,  
Democrat from Alaska, Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Allow me to say that I am in full agreement with your analysis of the U.S. position in Vietnam. I think it would be a good thing if your recent Senate speech on the matter could get as wide circulation as possible. In this regard could forward to me copies for distribution in Baltimore. I believe I could make use of 500 copies, which I would mail out from here. I would be glad to stand the cost of the mailing myself.

Very truly yours,

HERMAN M. HEYN.

WELLESLEY COLLEGE,  
Wellesley, Mass., March 22, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I want to tell you how completely I agree with your remarks about our policy in South Vietnam, as reported yesterday in the New York Times.

The sooner we get out of there the better. And if it falls to the Communists, they themselves are at war with one another, and

in any case, I simply cannot believe the loss would have any great effect on the United States.

Keep fighting.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER E. HOUGHTON,  
Hart Professor of English.

DELAWANA, CLIFTON, N.J.,  
March 21, 1964.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: It was not until today, when I read in the New York Times about your speech on March 10, that I became aware of your criticisms of administration policy in Vietnam.

I want to thank you for your forthright denunciation of the bloodletting in Vietnam. For a long time it has seemed as if everyone in Washington was resigned to our sliding helplessly into a deeper and deeper commitment to war. Senator MANSFIELD was an exception—last month he spoke out with great courage and pointed out that any moral obligation we may have to defend the previous government in South Vietnam does not require us to shed American blood in defense of General Khanh who overthrew it and jailed its leaders—but it was disheartening to see how little support he received from his colleagues.

For that reason I am especially grateful for your warning against sacrificing American lives in a country on the other side of the world, that we cannot hold indefinitely any more than the Communists can hold Cuba. You deserve the gratitude of the thousands of men whose lives may be lost if your advice is disregarded, and of their families.

Sincerely yours,

T. S. HOLMAN.

SILVER SPRING, Md.,  
March 16, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,  
Senator from Alaska,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on your wise and needed speech on Vietnam. It is badly needed, a discussion of what we are doing and why, in Vietnam.

I agree entirely that we ought to stop trying to impose our will and way on people obviously unwilling to accept it.

Sincerely,

H. DAVID HAMMOND, Ph. D.

KANSAS CITY, Mo.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I just read of your speech of March 10, 1964, and I want to say that I support your dissent on the United States-Vietnam policy.

Yours truly,

RICHARD B. HILL, Jr.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,  
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS,  
March 21, 1964.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I have just read your Senate remarks on U.S. policy in Vietnam (delivered March 10). Even though I am not one of your constituents, I want to express my admiration and appreciation for your stand. In these days of cover stories and blind policies pushed in the name of anticommunism, your remarks give hope to those who are striving for peace, and for a return to a rational foreign policy.

Please keep up the good work.

Sincerely,

RICHARD B. DU BOFF.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO.,

April 6, 1964.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRUENING: Even though I am not one of your constituents, I should like to let you know that I support your stand on the question of Vietnam.

I have followed with no small degree of interest the rather tragic developments in South Vietnam, and come to the conclusion that the withdrawal of U.S. military forces from South Vietnam is the best course of action we can take there. All are deplorable: The indiscriminate bombing of native villages, the great number of deaths of Vietnamese and Americans, the utterly stupendous amount of money wasted on this futile war operation. And its not over yet!

Some people tell us this year can be won. I should like to know just exactly on what these people base these optimistic predictions. I do not think there is anything to confirm such opinions.

I commend you for your reasoned, just, and courageous stand. Thank you.

Sincerely,

JOHN M. HYDER.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,  
April 5, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Congratulations on your splendid and courageous stand in favor of U.S. withdrawal from military involvement in South Vietnam. You deserve the gratitude of all people in this country who are hoping, working, and praying that peace on earth can be achieved.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. CATHERINE R. HARRIS.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,  
April 4, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: As a mother, as a housewife, and as a Christian, I protest our military involvement in Vietnam. As a mother because I do not want our sons to take part in senseless slaughter nor be the victims of native vengeance—as a budget-minded housewife because the U.S.A. cannot police the whole world by itself without going broke—and as a Christian because it is hypocritical to preach universal brotherhood when we are willing to accept as brothers only those who are politically amenable.

I write to you because I understand that you are one of the few men in public life courageous enough to call for a withdrawal of the American troops who are engaged in an undeclared war in Vietnam. What, may I ask, is the function of the United Nations if not to settle international disputes such as this? The millions of dollars which we are pouring out for weapons could be better spent in President Johnson's war on poverty right here at home. And if we are going to spend money on foreign aid, let it be for plowshares, not napalm bombs.

Sincerely,

Mrs. HUGH HENSHAW.

P.S.—Another use for military savings would be help for disaster victims such as those in your own home State.

H.H.

BALTIMORE, Md.,  
April 3, 1964.

Senator GRUENING,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My wife and I are so happy to hear that we do have some Senators in our

Congress who do have good levelheaded judgment in a plan to stop this needless killing in South Vietnam.

This present civil war is possible to start a huge world war. Most every human being is in favor of world peace. This present action of burning and bombing is only retarding the people to enjoy better living.

Our country would do much better to work and fight disease, river floods and possible earthquakes—plus civil rights here at home.

Foreign aid entanglements will retard our national welfare and has already caused much hatred toward the U.S.A.

We congratulate you, Senator, on your wonderful courage.

Sincerely yours,

FRED AND KIRSTEN HALLENGREN.

PHILADELPHIA, Pa.,  
March 23, 1964.

Senator GRUENING,  
U.S. Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I want you to know that, as a young mother very much worried about the possible outgrowths of the war in Vietnam, I appreciate deeply your courage for raising the question of withdrawal of our forces. For so long it has seemed that the only question has been, How shall we win this war at all costs? With no one willing to consider whether we should be there at all or not.

I believe the United States could, by no-strings economic aid to developing Asian countries, maintain both its prestige and influence in the area. In fact, the undeveloped countries would, I believe, think better of us for ending this bloody war than pursuing it.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JUNE S. ACKERMAN.

FREEPORT, MAINE,  
March 23, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: Warmest congratulations on your denunciation of the war in South Vietnam. Even if we were winning the war, we would have no business there. It is a folly, a delusion, and a scandal compounded daily. Yet only you, your colleague from Alaska, and Senator MOSS have had the courage and wisdom to speak out. What fatal passivity, what deadly apathy has befallen the American people to tolerate this outrage.

I am enclosing a piece I did for the Brunswick (Maine) Record on this subject. With best regards and profoundest thanks.

Sincerely,

DAVID L. GRAHAM.

[From the Brunswick (Maine) Record, Mar. 19, 1964]

#### ON THE CONTRARY (By David L. Graham)

If wishes were horses, beggars might ride. For more than 2 years we in the west have been riding the fulfillment of our fondest wish—dissension in the Communist camp. The wish was born of the cold war's long and, at times, nerve-racking ordeal. The Suez crisis, the Berlin crisis, the Cuban crisis—each has darkened our skies with the thunderhead of war, total destruction one lightning flash away. Accordingly, if there was one event we could have wished for, that event was a split between our enemies, Russia and Red China. The split developed and the imminence of war has abated as the split has deepened.

#### BACK TO THE BRINK

But now comes the Johnson administration with its talk of invading Communist

North Vietnam and threatens to toss aside our greatest gain in the cold war. For what could be more likely to reunite Russia and Red China than an American assault on their Asiatic protege, North Vietnam? China would come in automatically, even as the United States would respond to an invasion of Mexico, and Russia would have to come in or forfeit forever her leadership in the Communist world.

#### INCORRIGIBLE OPTIMISM

Once again Secretary of Defense McNamara has returned from South Vietnam, grim but optimistic, prophesying eventual victory for General Khanh's forces and recommending increased American aid. Fifty million dollars is the immediate prescription—in addition, of course, to the \$1½ million daily injection of American funds. This is Mr. McNamara's fourth visit to South Vietnam and the third Vietnamese leader he has urged us to put our money on.

And we mean money. Roughly \$5 billion in American money has gone to fight the Communist guerrillas in South Vietnam and the administration speaks daringly of spending one-half billion dollars to fight poverty in the United States. We donated \$2 billion to the doomed French effort in the area, and since 1954 we ourselves have squandered \$3 billion there.

So how are things today, \$5 billion later? Of all France's Asian empire, only South Vietnam, we have to say, remains in friendly hands, partially in friendly hands. Whole sections of South Vietnam, particularly in the fertile Mekong delta, are under the control of the Communist guerrillas. Hence the irony of the slogan "We want to march north," with which General Khanh's Vietnamese feted Secretary McNamara. In 10 years of fighting, the armies we support have been unable to clean up their own country. In fact, the situation has never been worse. As 200,000 French soldiers learned from their 9 years of defeat, Vietnam is a quicksand for money and a quicksand for men.

#### ELECTION COMING UP

During the last 6 months two South Vietnam regimes have caved in under the weight, so to speak, of American support. Secretary McNamara's faith in his third man, General Khanh, who has climbed out of the wreckage of both previous regimes, seems therefore, oddly optimistic. Is the administration letting this futile war drag on because it is fearful of ordering a withdrawal until after the November elections?

With our characteristic disinclination to face unpleasant realities, we have shut our eyes to the basic facts of the war, namely: (1) that we can settle nothing in this part of the world without Red China's consent—symbolic of our willful blindness is our refusal even to recognize Red China; and (2) that the people of South Vietnam have no heart for this fight. The Communist guerrillas could not survive if they were not, in large part, able to move as freely among the Vietnamese peasants as fish in water. These peasants we have rounded up in concentration camps (politely called "fortified villages") and we have bombed them with fire bombs, but still they don't like us.

Sinking into this morass deeper and deeper, we are too proud to admit our blunder and withdraw. For reasons of his own, De Gaulle has thrown us a life-preserver by urging the neutralization of Vietnam. This we have angrily repulsed. Neutralization would, of course, be difficult; its success doubtful. But our present policy holds out no hope whatever. Come home, McNamara. What is an American Secretary of Defense doing so far from Washington? That the defense of the United States begins in Asia we cannot believe.

AUSTIN, TEX.,  
March 28, 1964.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,  
Senator from the Great State of Alaska,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: My heartfelt congratulations I offer you for your courageous, wise, forthright stand on our peril in South Vietnam. I am confident this Nation made a grave mistake when we involved ourselves with Asian mainland dictators. This administration should openly admit our ghastly mistake and pull out lock, stock, and barrel. We can't win. Three billions and more of U.S. taxpayers' dollars have gone down the drain. Many American boys have needlessly, senselessly sacrificed their lives. And still Johnson says he is sending in more soldiers—more deadly arms. We've accomplished nothing so far. We can very well be guilty of provoking an all-out nuclear war. It's unthinkable.

Alaska and the Nation are proud of you Senator. Your stature is unimpeachable. We've overburdened with politicians. We sorely need statesmen in this deeply troubled, apprehensive, imperilled Nation. I have a very low opinion of the military in general. We have high moral standards, for example, our military won't use atomic weapons on the civilian populace or Vietcong. Instead we use the next best weapon napalm. We burn up alive whole villages of old men, women, the sick, little children with this liquid gasoline. Savagery is overtaking mankind. Nuclear war through vast conflagrations and poisons can very well devastate this fair earth we love and literally annihilate mankind. We fear. We hope. We pray. These monstrous evil sinister stockpiles of nuclear instruments of death we must destroy lest we ourselves die. It's almost midnight. Our security is gone. Keep up the good work, Senator. God knows we need you.

Sincerely,

M. A. GREEN.

SCHENECTADY, N.Y.,  
March 22, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: May I write to congratulate you on your fine statements you have made in opposition to the stepping up of the assistance our administration is making towards the war in South Vietnam? It is a truly dangerous policy if we wish to work out any peace in that part of the world.

Very truly yours,

M. G. COFFIN.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,  
March 21, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I and all my family want to congratulate you on your stand against insanity in Vietnam. It's good to know that some of our representatives have the guts and moral fortitude to stand against the pack. We offer you our sympathy our support and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

M. COLOW.

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,  
March 21, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,  
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SIR: I have been following with interest and hope your several speeches on the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Let me say right off that your enlightened views are a welcome relief to the distorted and jingoistic interpretations that Rusk and all too many others have placed on events there and the U.S. role in them.

History, unless it is written by Americans of a certain mental cast, will not look with kindness and moral forbearance upon the



1964

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8345

present period of American foreign policy, nor in particular, the brutal and unjustified war it is waging against an essentially indigenous popular movement which is comparatively unarmed and defenseless in the face of U.S. military might.

I only wish that I could translate my appreciation of your stand into an active support for you, or other Senators who are of like minds on this matter. I am, however, a Canadian and after several years of study in the United States am returning to Canada and to an academic position at the University of Manitoba. In going back it will be with the distinct impression that it could have been Canada and not Vietnam.

Second to that wish I would like to be able to report that there exists widespread support for your views here at the University of Michigan. There are, indeed, some who are reasonably knowledgeable about the social and political conditions in South Vietnam, and who consequently recognize the validity of your position. The Ann Arbor Women for Peace is such an organization which does share your concern. But I find most Americans, either within or without the academic community, to be pitifully informed about the war there and immune in their conviction that the United States is always right.

Let me say in closing that I welcomed above all your statements in which you squarely accepted that the consequences of an American withdrawal would probably be the formation of a new Communist state. Indeed, their administrative apparatus has been functioning in the countryside for years. For a liberal to do less would be to fall victim to the embarrassing charges of being naive and defeatist. Some time someone will have to bring home to the American electorate that not every revolutionary movement which gets labeled Communist is intrinsically evil and that a threat to American security does not exist in every corner of the world.

Again, let me convey my appreciation for your efforts and my hopes for their success. Sincerely,

GRANT COSBY.

MARCH 22, 1964.

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I am glad to see that at least one Senator is aware of the wasteful situation in South Vietnam. I hope that you and your colleagues will also take note of other areas in the world that are in the very same situation.

You have pointed out the case in South Vietnam and Cambodia, among other Asiatic countries, now what is to be done about it? Will it take many more wasteful years before our aid is reduced or better administered? How long does it take these obvious facts to sink into the heads of our leaders? We seem to be afraid of what these tiny countries will think or say about us, not the immediate damage being done, such as the 100-plus dead American men in South Vietnam.

Prompt and firm action is needed. Please do your best.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE J. BARSTOW.

PRINCETON, N.J.,

March 18, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: We applaud your statement concerning Vietnam, and the urgent need to get us out as soon as possible.

Please keep up the courageous work, and try to encourage others to speak out on this outrageous war.

Sincerely,

MRS. LOUISE BRILLINGS.

LAKE SIDE, CALIF.,

March 23, 1964.

DEAR SIR: Bring our troops home from South Vietnam at once.

End the persecution and concentration camps.

Encourage the assistance of the United Nations to supervise free elections.

Yours truly,

LILLIAN ALLEN.

NORTHAMPTON, MASS.,

March 21, 1964.

DEAR SENATOR GRUENING: I was delighted with the courageous position you've assumed toward American intervention in South Vietnam. When will we learn that what is good for the United States is not necessarily good for the world? War is something hideous and men dying can certainly not be justified in this context of affairs.

Yours,

PAUL AARON.

BROOKLYN, N.Y.,

March 13, 1964.

HON. ERNEST GRUENING,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I support your stand in regard to South Vietnam. I would go even further and urge immediate negotiations looking toward peace. Further help to Khanh and his gang will lead toward escalation of the war and danger of its involving North Vietnam and even China.

I am writing Senator Morse congratulating him on his joining forces with you in efforts to stop this criminal adventure of ours.

Respectfully yours,

MOE BRAGIN.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I rise once again to commend the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] for his courage, foresight, and statesmanship in opposing McNamara's war in South Vietnam. Once again he has pointed out that unilateral American military action in South Vietnam is not justified.

I am greatly disappointed in two statements of the President of the United States in recent hours. One statement he made yesterday to the editors in New York on the war in South Vietnam when he said:

The situation in Vietnam is difficult, but there is an old American saying that when the going gets tough, the tough get going.

I do not think that is very good imagery to present to the world as the image of the United States. I continue the quotation:

Let no one doubt that we are in this battle as long as South Vietnam wants our support and needs our assistance to protect its freedom.

What freedom is there in South Vietnam which is involved in the civil war? We are supporting a military tyrant—a military fascist—who is denying freedom to the people of South Vietnam. Both sides in the civil war are totalitarian. One is the military fascist, the other Communist. Therefore, both are police states opposed to human rights.

I say to my President that I believe the tough position for the United States to take is to ask the United Nations to come in and organize a peacekeeping corps in South Vietnam under the charter. I say

most respectfully to my President that we ought to stay within the charter of the United Nations. U.S. action in South Vietnam is outside the charter. We shall hear about being outside the charter, in my judgment, from a good many quarters of the world in the months ahead.

So I plead with my President again to take our country back inside the provisions of the United Nations charter and ask the United Nations to come in and maintain the peace in South Vietnam. We are cooperating with the United Nations in such a program in the Congo, in the Middle East, and in Cyprus. We have a duty to do so under the United Nations charter. I repeat again on the floor of the Senate that the United States of America in South Vietnam is acting outside the charter of the United Nations. I regret very much that my President took the position that he took in New York yesterday on South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I think the American people are entitled to know what is underway in regard to any expansion of the war against another country, namely, North Vietnam. This morning Drew Pearson had a very disturbing column on the danger of extending the war into North Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LODGE "BOMBHELL" SEEN PLANNED

(By Drew Pearson)

Reports from Saigon indicate that Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge may be preparing to disassociate himself from the South Vietnamese policies of the Johnson administration.

There is also a report that Lodge may do so in the same spectacular manner in which Gen. Douglas MacArthur courted removal by President Truman—namely, a showdown over U.S. bombing of Chinese Communist territory.

The blueblood Bostonian is not unaware of the Republican fire he is drawing for serving a Democratic administration in this Asian hotspot.

Indeed, the reliable Louis Harris survey which shows Lodge far out in front in the Oregon presidential primary, also registers strong criticism of his role in South Vietnam. An overwhelming 84 percent of the Republican voters, though they liked Lodge, held him partly responsible for Vietnam.

Lodge has made clear to his backers that he has no intention of passing up the opportunity to become President. He has told them that it not only was his duty to accept the call, but that he consulted with top Republicans before accepting the ambassadorship.

One who agreed he couldn't turn it down, according to Lodge, was former President Eisenhower.

Far more significant, however, are hints that Lodge may be planning a dramatic break with the Johnson administration over South Vietnam.

The Ambassador has written a private letter to his old friend, former Speaker Joe Martin, of Massachusetts, telling of his desire to carry the war into North Vietnam.

It was precisely such a letter over a decade ago that stirred up the great controversy over expanding the Korean war into Manchuria. The circumstances are startlingly similar.

April 21

8346

At that time Gen. Douglas MacArthur wrote to the same Joe Martin, complaining about President Truman's failure to carry the war into Manchuria. The letter was released; Truman fired MacArthur; the general came home in a blaze of publicity.

It may be that the Ambassador, an impressive if less spectacular than MacArthur, had this episode in mind when he wrote to Martin.

Will history repeat itself?

(NOTE.—Though maintaining a discreet diplomatic silence, Lodge has also taken issue with the Johnson administration over the prohibition against U.S. helicopters flying closer than 3 miles to Cambodia. Red guerrillas have the habit of hitting targets in South Vietnam, then running for cover into Cambodia. Lodge has argued that helicopters should be permitted to pursue them all the way to the border.)

#### ACHESON AND MAC ARTHUR

Former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, his memory pricked by the renewed controversy over Gen. Douglas MacArthur, has told friends about the reaction inside President Truman's Cabinet the day after MacArthur was fired.

The headlines were aflame with the news of the great hero's sacking, and public indignation was bursting over Mr. Truman's head.

He strode into the Cabinet meeting and, without formality, brought up what was on everyone's mind.

"Well," he demanded, "what do you think of it?"

Truman turned first to his Secretary of State and asked for Acheson's comment.

"I am reminded," said Acheson, "of the story of the Army couple who brought up a beautiful daughter in a succession of Army camps. She was always surrounded by soldier boys who swarmed about her like bees around honey.

"Her parents naturally were concerned about her in such an environment. One day, when the husband returned from his duties, he was greeted at the gate by his distressed wife who announced that their daughter was pregnant.

"The man reached into his pocket, pulled a handkerchief, wiped his brow, and said, 'Thank God that's over.'

"That," said Acheson, "is how I feel about the firing of MacArthur."

#### JITTERY CONGRESSMAN

MIKE KIRWAN, the Ohio Democrat who has pushed his congressional colleagues around for a long time, has started pushing his chief opponent around in Youngstown. The 77-year-old KIRWAN seems so worried about his reelection that his henchman recently barred KIRWAN's opponent from a dinner honoring Msgr. Joseph Koch.

When Robert Hagan, chairman of the Trumbull County Commissioners, who is running against KIRWAN, turned up at the dinner he was blocked at the door and told he couldn't come in.

"You're not wanted here. Here's your money back," said big hulking Al Shipka, who works for the United Steel Workers District 26, whose boss, James Griffen, is KIRWAN's No. 1 backer.

"But I was invited by the guest of honor," protested Hagan.

"He didn't mention it," replied Shipka, "you'd better go before there's trouble."

Rather than cause trouble, Hagan departed.

Mr. MORSE. Also Mr. Lippmann is quite right in the column he wrote this morning which was referred to by the Senator from Alaska and inserted in the Record by him.

I close by commenting on the second statement of the President, which I

deeply regret. It is the statement, which appeared in the press this morning, in which he clearly implies that if he does not get the foreign aid bill in the amount he wants, he will send to Congress a supplemental request. Of course, that clearly implies that he will see to it that the amount he does receive is spent before the fiscal year is over, and then ask for a supplemental amount. He has the clear power and right to do that if he wants to. I question his wisdom in trying to do it.

As I said at the public hearing of the Foreign Relations Committee this morning, I regret that statement, because if the President thinks that is the way to establish a spirit of cooperation between the two ends of Pennsylvania Avenue, he could not be more wrong. In my judgment, when Congress is through exercising its right, under the separation of powers doctrine, to check the Executive in reference to the amount of money that should be appropriated for foreign aid in a given fiscal year, it is the clear obligation of the President to cut his spending accordingly, and not spend himself into a deficit.

As I announced in the Foreign Relations Committee this morning, if that is the strategy the President wants to adopt, I will be more opposed to a supplemental request than I am to the aid bill which is pending. I am doing my best in the Foreign Relations Committee to see if a common ground cannot be reached for a foreign aid bill that can be justified on the facts. In my judgment the request of the President for \$3.4 billion cannot be justified on the facts. I shall continue to draw out the facts from AID, the State Department, and the Pentagon, so the American people can form a judgment as to what the final amount should be. I think it probably should be in the neighborhood of \$2.5 billion.

I hope we shall not hear any more suggestions that if we do not give the President what he wants, he will ask for a supplemental amount, which clearly implies to me that he will spend himself into a deficit and then ask for more money. That is not the way to encourage teamwork on the part of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

#### VISIT OF FORMER PRESIDENT BETANCOURT OF VENEZUELA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is a great privilege to welcome to the Senate today one of the great champions of freedom, constitutional government, social justice, and economic progress in this hemisphere, former President Romulo Betancourt, of Venezuela. I am privileged today to be host at a luncheon at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for President Betancourt.

Less than 6 weeks ago a new government was inaugurated in Venezuela, headed by President Raul Leon. President Leon is the first constitutional President in Venezuelan history to succeed another constitutional President. He was chosen in a free election in December, an election held despite contin-

uous violent harassment by Communist and Castroite groups. His victory, together with the impressive showing of COPEI, the partner of Action Democratic in the Betancourt coalition, is assurance that Venezuela will continue the same enlightened progressive domestic policy and pro-Western foreign policy that characterized the Betancourt government.

The successful peaceful transition from one freely chosen government to another is a triumph for the principles underlying the Alliance for Progress, a triumph for the American policy in Latin America. No one would have been more pleased to witness this triumph of Venezuelan democracy than our late President John F. Kennedy. And no one is more responsible for this triumph than the man we have chosen to honor today, President Betancourt.

The election was a triumph because it showed that the people of a wealthy, rapidly developing country like Venezuela support the political parties whose programs and objectives are virtually identical to the aims of the Alliance for Progress.

President Betancourt's government was rightly considered a model to be copied by other members of the Alliance for Progress. Although each Latin American Republic is unique in many respects and must be considered accordingly, the Betancourt record illustrates certain truths of general applicability—which should be heeded by all members of the Alliance for Progress, including the United States.

President Betancourt's record merits emulation because it reveals a profound understanding of the political, social, and economic problems of the hemisphere that the Alliance for Progress was designed to solve. This profound understanding included three principal facets:

First. A clear perception of the revolutionary fervor sweeping the continent resulting from the perpetuation of shocking social and economic injustice.

Second. An appreciation of the necessity for economic and social progress to be achieved within a framework of democratic constitutional government.

Third. A correct assessment of the nature of the Communist threat in the Western Hemisphere.

Several years before President Kennedy launched the Alliance for Progress, the Betancourt government had already begun to grapple with the problem of widespread poverty of the many amidst the opulence of the few. It had already initiated programs designed to accelerate the economic development of Venezuela and to spread the benefits of this economic development to the masses of the people.

The Betancourt government, which included both his own Accion Democratica Party and the Social Christian Party—COPEI—did not solve all the social and economic problems of Venezuela—nor will its successor. But it did in many ways illustrate the validity of President Kennedy's understanding of the Alliance for Progress. President Kennedy realized that though we face grave economic problems in Latin America, these must